REMARKS

Claims 1-9 have been examined, claims 6 and 8 are amended, and claims 1-9 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of all outstanding rejections and objections are requested.

Claims 1, 3, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Suzuki.

Claim 1recites a system for indicating the location of an energy zone on an object surface. The energy zone is the part of the object surface that is imaged onto an IR detector by the IR optical system. Claim 1 further recites a video sub-system for displaying a displayed image of at least a part of the object surface not included in the energy zone and of at least a part of the object surface included in the energy zone; a range-finding sub-system that outputs a distance signal; and, an optical overlay sub-system.

The optical overlay subsystem overlays a shape outline, having a dimension determined by a received measured distance, over the displayed image that indicates the extent of a displayed image included in the energy zone.

The reference Nakamura discloses an infrared monitoring system that includes an infrared camera and a visible light camera both viewing the same scene to be monitored. As depicted in Fig. 4, the zoom lens 23 adjusts the frame size of the visible light image precisely to confirm to that of the infrared image. (3:47-50) The visible light incident on the visible light camera is attenuated so that only light energy above a threshold is imaged. The image from both the infrared camera and the visible camera are displayed on a TV monitor. (4:29-30). The images are also sent to a binarization circuit that performs a masking operation so that the reflecting region from the visible light camera is a not-to-be-processed region when calculating the temperature. (5:1-26).

Figs. 6B-6C show respectively, the reflecting region over a threshold (4:45), the temperature rising region (4:47), and the superposition of the reflecting region and temperature rising region (4:63-64).

The Office Action states that Nakamura shows a system for indicating the location of an energy zone on an object surface with a video subsystem, and an optical overlay system, but does not show a range finder sub-system.

In the "Response to Arguments" section of the Office Action it is stated that Nakamura superposes an image of the infrared camera on the image of the visible camera and it is

concluded that Nakamura does overlay a shape of the energy zone onto a display that is displaying an image of at least part of an object surface the is not included in the energy zone and of at least a part of the object surface that is included in the energy zone, citing Figs. 6A-6D.

This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The establishment of a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires that all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP §2143.03

Nakamura and Suzuki, singly or in combination, do not fairly suggest or teach the limitation recited in claim 1 of overlaying a shape outline, having a dimension determined by a received measured distance, over the displayed image of the object surface and with the shape outline indicating the extent of a displayed image included in the energy zone. (Emphasis added).

As described above, Nakamura superposes a high reflective region over a high temperature region. There is no teaching or suggestion of overlaying a shape outline having a dimension determined by a received measured distance. Further, Suzuki merely shows a rangefinder and provides no teachings regarding overlaying a shape outline having a dimension determined by a received measured distance.

Further, the highly reflected region and high temperature regions defined in Nakamura are not related to the energy zone as defined in claim 1 and the specification where the energy zone is the area on the object surface that is imaged onto the IR detector. The high temperature region of Nakamura is usually only a part of the object surface that is imaged onto the IR detector and the highly reflected region has nothing to do with the IR detector.

Accordingly, pending claim 1 is deemed patentable over the cited references. Pending claims 6 and 8 recite similar limitations and are allowable for the same reasons and other reasons. The remaining claims are dependent claims and are allowable for the same reasons as the independent claims and also recite additional limitations and are thus additionally allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at (925) 944-3320.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles E. Krueger
Reg. No. 30,077

LAW OFFICE OF CHARLES E. KRUEGER
P.O.Box 5607
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
Tel: (925) 944-3320 / Fax: (925) 944-3363